

Epping Forest District Council Representations to the Draft Local Plan Consultation 2016 (Regulation 18)

Stakeholder ID 2575 Name Susan Tetlow

Method Survey

Date

This document has been created using information from the Council's database of responses to the Draft Local Plan Consultation 2016. Some elements of the full response such as formatting and images may not appear accurately. Should you wish to review the original response, please contact the Planning Policy team: ldfconsult@eppingforestdc.gov.uk

Survey Response:

1. Do you agree with the overall vision that the Draft Plan sets out for Epping Forest District?

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 1:

Epping town and surrounding area has been getting busier and busier over the last number of years and has become unrecognisable as the market town we chose to live in. Quality of life for existing residents will certainly not be enhanced due to further pressures on the infrastructure which appears an impossible task to improve on under current numbers of residents. How this will be funded and by whom is not clear? The impact of huge number of additional homes will have an adverse effect on the wellbeing of the residents. The highways will be at standstill, the public transport will be full to bursting point (as it is now particularly at rush hour), the local economy will only be supported if the shops are of interest to residents (many now travel to large supermarkets and shopping areas outside town). The green areas of tranquility will be massively reduced which again will be at detriment to ones health and well being.

Response to the Draft Local Plan Consultation 2016 (Regulation 18)

Stakeholder ID 2575

Name Susan

Tetlow

2. Do you agree with the overall vision that the Draft Plan sets out for Epping Forest District?

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 2:

It appears that Epping, N Weald and Theydon Bois is being allocated vast more numbers of housing. The green belt is precious and should on no account be dissipated so future generations cannot enjoy it. It is there for many reasons including wildlife corridors which will be devastating to the wildlife population if lost. The 11400 houses suggested by EFDC is an unjustifiable huge number. Sites that are already currently available in Epping for building would be favourable to use - eg the St Johns Rd site (the old junior school) which is currently derelict. Redevelopment of the Bower Hill disused factory site. Surely it will be better to infill with new housing rather than burst onto green belt, providing the infrastructure is improved and meets the needs of the people.

3. Do you agree with the proposals for development around Harlow?

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 3:

I strongly disagree with any invasion of the green belt land of which again these sites around Harlow are being identified. However fewer numbers of housing on these sites will be more realistic and favourable as any numbers will impact heavily on the surrounding areas. To understand how the infrastructure will cope with huge more numbers of people and cars is quite impossible.

4. Do you agree with the proposed shopping area in...

Epping?

No

Buckhurst Hill?

No

Loughton Broadway?

No

Chipping Ongar?

No

Loughton High Road?

No

Waltham Abbey?

No

Please explain your choice in Question 4:

I don't feel able to comment too much on this subject as The shopping sites surely should be proposed once if any of the proposed housing has been agreed. Local shops for residents are clearly important and they need to

Response to the Draft Local Plan Consultation 2016 (Regulation 18)

be sympathetic to the areas. You only need to look at the drastic change of Epping High Street over the years to realise this.

5. Do you agree with the proposals for new employment development?

Disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 5:

Recently certainly over the past 10 years there have been sites of employment either demolished or shut down and currently in ruin. So this is clearly short sighted of the EFDC as now you are proposing to re instate where possible? Clearly it would be nice to have local employers and yes I agree that it will be better to re-instate on existing sites than encroach on green belt land.

6. Do you agree with the proposed sites in your area?

Epping (Draft Policy P 1):

No

Please provide reasons for your view on Epping:

to speak of individual sites is difficult as I feel that further information of type of housing should be given together with numbers. However big concerns include Sr-0208, this site is inaccessible, an area of natural beauty and tranquility, ancient hedgerows and ancient trees, historic relevance and An invaluable resource for wildlife. The traffic on Kendal avenue is currently to capacity particularly at rush hour with vehicles travelling to Epping station. Trains also at breaking point. Site Sr.-0153 is an already congested area, invaluable resource for wildlife, provides open space and recreation for local residents, Sr. 0071 is an outstanding open space offering openness and tranquility. To build on the station car parks is questionable - who funds the large bill of providing an underground car park? More homes mean more people using the trains which are already bursting so how will this be overcome? Sr0347, the council were short sighted when they had the chance to redevelop the sports centre at the new St Johns senior school so now the proposals show demolishing existing sports centre and no mention of any new sports facilities? Basically I object strongly on building on all of the green built areas. These green areas protect us from pollution, provides diverse habitats, benefits our health and well being, provides areas of tranquility, invaluable resource for all.

Loughton (Draft Policy P 2)

No opinion

Please provide reasons for your view on Loughton:

Waltham Abbey (Draft Policy P 3)

No opinion

Please provide reasons for your view on Waltham Abbey:

Chipping Ongar (Draft Policy P 4)

No opinion

Please provide reasons for your view on Chipping Ongar:

Buckhurst Hill (Draft Policy P 5)

No opinion

Please provide reasons for your view on Buckhurst Hill:

North Weald Bassett (Draft Policy P 6)

No opinion

Please provide reasons for your view on North Weald Bassett:

Chigwell (Draft Policy P 7)

No opinion

Please provide reasons for your view on North Weald Bassett:

Theydon Bois (Draft Policy P 8)

No opinion

Please provide reasons for your view on Theydon Bois:

Roydon (Draft Policy P 9)

No opinion

Response to the Draft Local Plan Consultation 2016 (Regulation 18)

Please provide reasons for your view on Roydon:

Nazeing (Draft Policy P 10)

No opinion

Please provide reasons for your view on Nazeing:

Thornwood (Draft Policy P 11)

No opinion

Please provide reasons for your view on Thornwood:

Coopersale, Fyfield, High Ongar, Lower Sheering, Moreton, Sewardstonbury, Sheering, Stapleford Abbots (Draft Policy P 12)

No opinion

Please provide reasons for your view on Coopersale, Fyfield, High Ongar, Lower Sheering, Moreton, Sewardstonbury, Sheering, Stapleford Abbots:

7. Do you agree with the approach to infrastructure provision being proposed in the plan?

Strongly disagree

Please explain your choice in Question 7:

Further information is required to highlight additional infrastructure. We have not been given this. This should be agreed prior to any further development proposals. Already we experience extremely busy trains, extremely busy doctors surgeries, lack of school spaces, highways congested.....

8. An Interim Sustainability Appraisal has been commissioned to support the Draft Local Plan. We would welcome any comments you may have on this.

Sustainability is huge and important but to date I have not seen this document? This is required to be available to all.

9. Do you wish to comment on any other policies in the Draft Local Plan?

This plan document is very difficult to read and areas are unclear. I am disappointed on the huge number of houses proposed. As previously mentioned the trains are at breaking point, the highways are congested to stand still at many times of the day particularly through Epping town. I am not adverse to sensible and sustainable development to enhance our future and encourage young people to stay in this area with affordable housing.

Response to the Draft Local Plan Consultation 2016 (Regulation 18)